



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

In addition to the documents dealing with the armed neutralities of 1780 and 1800 appears the treaty of March 27, 1794, between Sweden and Denmark, the effort of French diplomacy to start a back-fire in the face of the engulfing maritime policy set up by England in the coalition treaties of 1793 and the arbitrary Orders in Council of the years 1793 and 1794. The reader regrets, once this subject is touched, that an extract from only one of these several treaties of 1793 is published (the Anglo-Spanish convention of February 21). A good comprehension of the British naval-diplomatic system of 1793-1794 cannot be had without a perusal of the treaties with the other nations of the coalition. While the work was being done, it would have been most useful to include also a summary of these Orders in Council, with the protests of the neutrals and replies to the same, particularly because the diplomacy of the United States was so closely connected with the system. There is no mention of the invitation to the United States by the two Scandinavian powers to join their abortive armed neutrality of 1794,¹ nor of their failure to duplicate the agreements of 1780, for one reason because of the refusal of the United States to accept its first tempting invitation to join an entangling alliance. Any one who has read the English, French, and Scandinavian despatches of the years 1793-1800 will realize that the possibility of a counter-coalition in the shape of armed neutrality against Great Britain was the pole-star of French diplomacy as regarded England. The reader does not discover any of the documents indicating this, nor any notes explaining it, in this volume. It is certainly the introduction to the final consummation of the armed neutrality of 1800. Perhaps the specific title of the book, however, does not demand the inclusion of these state papers of 1793-1800.

S. F. BEMIS.

Authority in the Modern State. By HAROLD J. LASKI, sometime Exhibitioner of New College, Oxford; of the Department of History in Harvard University. (New Haven: Yale University Press; London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press. 1919. Pp. 398. \$3.00.)

THIS work consists of five lengthy chapters, each subdivided into several topics or minor chapters. Chapter I., which gives its title to the book, is a sort of sequel to the author's earlier work *Studies in the Problem of Sovereignty*, and is to be followed by "a definitely constructive analysis of politics in the perspective set by the first chapter of this present volume". Chapters II., III., IV., are related studies giving expositions of the political theories, especially with reference to sovereignty, of Bonald, Lamennais, and Royer-Collard, French writers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The first writer, reacting against the

¹ See the article, "The United States and the Abortive Armed Neutrality of 1794", in this *Review*, XXIV. 26-47. ED.

teachings of the Revolution, taught, as against individualism, a theory of social solidarity, theocratic in type, under the direction of a divinely appointed sovereign ruler. Lamennais, on the other hand, starting from somewhat the same basis, during the course of his long life slowly evolved from an ardent supporter of royalty, the Church, and papal supremacy into an advocate of spiritual and democratic freedom in religion and in politics, ending in his expulsion from the Church and the condemnation of his later works. The third writer stood midway between the *ancien régime* and the newer radicalism, and sought to work out a compromise point of view by providing checks against despotism, through emphasis on liberty of the press and of the conscience and a stable government of a parliamentary type.

Chapter V. is an interesting study of the growth of associations (syndicalism) in the administrative system of France; a tendency arising, he argues, as a reaction against the older teaching that civil servants are mere cogs in the machinery of government without voice or protest, and a consequent movement to democratize administration through the admission of the right of civil servants to organize and to strike, if necessary, for recognition of rights and for a voice in the administrative system.

These last four chapters are excellent studies of their subjects, thorough, fairly clear in thought, and well worth careful attention from those interested in the development of French political theories and tendencies.

Chapter I., Authority in the Modern State, is more definitely the author's own study of sovereignty, based chiefly on English sources, with occasional references to such American authorities as the *New Republic*, the *Harvard Law Review*, and Professor Roscoe Pound, and to the legal opinions of Justice Holmes, "the profoundest student of the American Constitution".

The state, to the author, "is always a territorial society in which there is a distinction between government and subjects". The state is different from *society*, and, following Rousseau, government is merely an executive organ by which the state-will can be carried into effect. The usually accepted theory of sovereignty is denied by the author, who in fact is almost prepared to reject the entire idea of sovereignty, especially in federations like the United States, or when in the future we shall have a "federalist society" (one based on pluralism); for, "a democratic society must reject the sovereign state as by definition inconsistent with democracy".

This conclusion, in the critic's opinion, is obtained through a defective definition of the state and a constant confusion of government with state and ethics with politics. Nor, in his discussion, do the distinctions between sovereignty, the legal sovereign, and governmental powers seem to be kept clear, nor the distinction between the people and the electorate, which is really a part of government. The chapter as a whole,

as an argument for a broader and more intelligent democracy, is excellent, but one may question whether (to quote the advertisement) the author's positive views are "constructive, and, for this country, almost entirely new".

In passing, one may regret that the Yale Press allowed so many typographical errors to slip through.

J. Q. DEALEY.

The Life of Lamartine. By H. REMSEN WHITEHOUSE. In two volumes. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1918. Pp. xiii, 464; ix, 527. \$10.00.)

IN the history of Europe in the nineteenth century there were at least three men of great and commanding importance, who succeeded in so conducting their lives, and in so fashioning their personalities, as to render the task of any would-be biographers extraordinarily parlous and harassing. Either they floated so frequently in cloudland, or burrowed so constantly underground, or assumed such Protean shapes at different times under the pressure of circumstances or in response to the inner promptings of their natures, that they repeatedly, and often at very critical moments, elude or baffle the investigator and writer who is disposed to do them honor by devoting years of a precious lifetime to the chronicling of their manifold doings and sayings for the perpetuation of their fame and the edification or enlightenment of posterity. The task of the biographer is hard enough in all conscience without the admixture of these elements of mystification or contradiction. If you float in the clouds, refraction tends to leave a distorted image upon the retina of the interested spectator. If you burrow underground, the earth being more or less opaque, our vision is obstructed. If you assume Protean shapes, we soon become distracted and lose our confidence in ever seizing you at the authentic and veritable moment of self-revelation, and we retire from the contest defeated and indignant and you go without your biographer.

The three men I have in mind who would unquestionably have fared better at the hands of scholars had they presented fewer complexities and obscurities of life and character, are Mazzini, Napoleon III., and Lamartine. It palpably requires such an exorbitant amount of bird-lime to catch these particular creatures that the student is very likely to abandon the chase before it has begun. No one in any land has yet arisen to draw an adequate portrait of Mazzini or of Napoleon III.

However, the third member of our trying trilogy has found what he so richly deserved, a patient, thorough, and talented biographer who has succeeded admirably in filling one of the *lacunae* of contemporary historical literature that sadly needed filling. The result is a book which does justice to its subject, and which is as authoritative and final as any work of historical scholarship and personal interpretation is ever likely